arXiv:1604.08446v2 [math.GR] 1 Sep 2016

Sofic metric groups and continuous logic

A.Ivanov *

September 5, 2016

Abstract We define sofic, weakly sofic, linear sofic and hyperlinear metric groups and discuss some issues involving axiomatizability of these classes in continuous logic.
2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 20E26; 03C20.
Keywords: Sofic groups, continuous logic.

1 Introduction

This paper concerns several questions involving axiomatizability of the class of sofic groups in continuous logic. This issue has been already discussed in our paper [12] (see the final part of Introduction). Now we extend this discussion in order to answer several questions addressed to the author after posting [12].

Let us consider the class $\mathcal{G}$ of all continuous structures which are metric groups (G, d) with bi-invariant metrics $d \leq 1$. We defined in [12] the subclass $\mathcal{G}_{sof} \subset \mathcal{G}$ of all *sofic metric groups* as all closed metric subgroups of metric ultraproducts of finite symmetric groups with Hamming metrics. In order to approach to the Gromov's question of soficity of all countable groups (see [5], [14]) we asked if the equality $\mathcal{G}_{sof} = \mathcal{G}$ holds. We emphasize that in this question groups are considered together with metrics. Thus this equality is a stronger version of the problem of soficity of all countable groups. We hoped that the corresponding counterexamples could be interesting with respect to the original question. We will see below that in fact there are easy examples

*The research is supported by Polish National Science Centre grant DEC2011/01/B/ST1/01406

of (finite) metric groups which do not belong to $\mathcal{G}_{sof}$. At the moment we do not know how useful they are.

On the other hand let us consider the class $\mathcal{G}_{w.sof}$ of weakly sofic continuous metric groups, i.e. continuous metric groups (G, d) which embed into a metric ultraproduct of finite metric groups with invariant length functions bounded by 1 [11]. We now see that it properly extends $\mathcal{G}_{sof}$. Does this class coincide with $\mathcal{G}$?

Note that the positive answer to this question implies that any group is weakly sofic in the standard sense of [11]. On the other hand if there is a non-weakly sofic group G in the standard sense, then for every metric d the metric group (G, d) does not satisfy a sentence of continuous logic which holds in all weakly sofic metric groups. This follows from the observation that $\mathcal{G}_{w.sof}$ is the minimal subclass of $\mathcal{G}$ which is axiomatizable in continuous logic and which contains all finite metric groups with metrics ≤ 1 (see the corresponding discussion in Section 2).

It is interesting that to get a positive answer to the questions above it suffices to prove that all finitely generated free groups (i.e. sofic groups) equipped with bi-invariant discrete metrics ≤ 1 belong to $\mathcal{G}_{w.sof}$. This follows from [7] (see Section 3.2 there and Remark 2.5 below).

In our paper we discuss these and some other questions of this type, for example in the cases of linear sofic groups and hyperlinear groups. We pay a special attention to discrete members of these classes. All our results will be formulated in Section 2. It can be considered as a continuation of this introduction.

In the rest of the introduction we briefly remind the reader some preliminaries of continuous logic. Although this material is not necessary for our main results it serves as a platform of the paper. In particular Theorem 1.1 and its corollary given in Proposition 2.3 tell us which questions are basic in our investigations.

Continuous structures. We fix a countable continuous signature

$$L = \{d, R_1, ..., R_k, ..., F_1, ..., F_l, ...\}.$$

Let us recall that a *metric L-structure* is a complete metric space (M, d) with d bounded by 1, along with a family of uniformly continuous operations on M and a family of predicates R_i, i.e. uniformly continuous maps from appropriate M^{k_i} to $[0, 1]$. It is usually assumed that to a predicate symbol R_i a continuity modulus γ_i is assigned so that when $d(x_j, x'_j) < \gamma_i(\varepsilon)$ with $1 \leq j \leq k_i$ the corresponding predicate of M satisfies

$$|R_i(x_1, ..., x_j, ..., x_{k_i}) - R_i(x_1, ..., x'_j, ..., x_{k_i})| < \varepsilon.$$

In this paper we usually assume that γ_i coincides with id. In this case we do not mention the appropriate modulus. We also fix continuity moduli for

functional symbols. Note that each countable structure can be considered as a complete metric structure with the discrete $\{0,1\}$-metric.

By completeness continuous substructures of a continuous structure are always closed subsets.

Atomic formulas are the expressions of the form $R_i(t_1,...,t_r)$, $d(t_1,t_2)$, where t_i are terms (built from functional L-symbols). In metric structures they can take any value from $[0,1]$. *Statements* concerning metric structures are usually formulated in the form

$$\phi = 0$$

(called an *L-condition*), where ϕ is a *formula*, i.e. an expression built from 0,1 and atomic formulas by applications of the following functions:

$$x/2\ ,\ x\dot{-}y = max(x-y,0)\ ,\ min(x,y)\ ,\ max(x,y)\ ,\ |x-y|\ ,$$

$$\neg(x) = 1-x\ ,\ x\dot{+}y = min(x+y,1)\ ,\ sup_x \text{ and } inf_x.$$

Note that all diadic numbers ≤ 1 are formulas. A *theory* is a set of L-conditions without free variables (here sup_x and inf_x play the role of quantifiers).

It is worth noting that any formula is a γ-uniformly continuous function from the appropriate power of M to $[0,1]$, where γ is the minimum of continuity moduli of L-symbols appearing in the formula.

The condition that the metric is bounded by 1 is not necessary. It is often assumed that d is bounded by some rational number d_0. In this case the (truncated) functions above are appropriately modified.

Given a family M_i of structures with metrics d_i, $i \in I$, and an ultrafilter D on I, the *metric ultraproduct* $\prod_I M_i/D$ is defined as follows. For $(u_i)_I$ and $(v_i)_I \in \prod_I M_i$ define the distance

$$d((u_i)_I,(v_i)_I) = lim_{i\to D} d_i(u_i,v_i),$$

i.e. by the rule that for any $\varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon_2$ from $[0,1]$ the distance between $(u_i)_I$ and $(v_i)_I$ is in the interval $(\varepsilon_1,\varepsilon_2)$ if and only if the set $\{i : d_i(u_i,v_i) \in (\varepsilon_1,\varepsilon_2)\}$ belongs to the ultrafilter D. This is well-defined by compactness of $[0,r]$. The structure $\prod_I M_i/D$ consists of classes of the relation $d((x_i)_I,(y_i)_I) = 0$. Its operations and predicates are defined in the natural way.

Axiomatisability in continuous logic When one considers classes axiomatizable in continuous logic it is obviously assumed that all operations and predicates are uniformly continuous with respect to some fixed continuity moduli. Suppose $\mathcal{C}$ is a class of metric L-structures. Let $Th^c(\mathcal{C})$ be the set of all closed L-conditions which hold in all structures of $\mathcal{C}$. It is proved in [4] (Proposition 5.14 and Remark 5.15) that every model of $Th^c(\mathcal{C})$ is elementary equivalent to some ultraproduct of structures from $\mathcal{C}$. Moreover by Proposition 5.15 of [4] we have the following statement.

The class $\mathcal{C}$ is axiomatizable in continuous logic if an only if it is closed under metric isomorphisms and ultraproducts and its complement is closed under ultrapowers.

Let $Th^c_{\sup}(\mathcal{C})$ be the set of all closed L-conditions of the form

$$sup_{x_1} sup_{x_2} ... sup_{x_n} \varphi = 0 \ (\ \varphi \text{ does not contain } inf_{x_i},\ sup_{x_i}\ ),$$

which hold in all structures of $\mathcal{C}$. Some standard arguments also give the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1 *(1) The class $\mathcal{C}$ is axiomatizable in continuous logic if an only if it is closed under metric isomorphisms, ultraproducts and taking elementary submodels.*

(2) The class $\mathcal{C}$ is axiomatizable in continuous logic by $Th^c_{sup}(\mathcal{C})$ if an only if it is closed under metric isomorphisms, ultraproducts and taking substructures.

Proof. Statements (1) and (2) are similar. In both cases necessity is obvious. Let us consider the sufficiency direction of statement (2). Let a continuous structure M satisfy $Th^c_{sup}(\mathcal{C})$. The atomic diagram of M consists of all equalities of the form $d(t_1, t_2) = r$ and $R(\bar{t}) = r$ with parameters from M. Fixing a small rational $\varepsilon > 0$ we replace these equalities by the corresponding inequalities

$$|d(t_1, t_2) - r'| \leq \varepsilon/2\ ,\ |R(\bar{t}) - r'| \leq \varepsilon/2,$$

where r' is a rational number with $|r - r'| < \varepsilon/2$. Let $D_\varepsilon(M)$ be the set of all statements of this form. Let I be the collection of all finite subsets of the union $\bigcup\{D_\varepsilon(M) : \varepsilon \in \mathbb{Q}^+\}$.

Let $i \in I$ depend on parameters $\bar{a}$. We may assume that $i \subset D_\varepsilon(M)$ for some fixed ε (choosing the minimal one in i). Let $\bar{x}$ correspond to parameters $\bar{a}$. Note that the statemet

$$\sup_{\bar{x}} max(\{|d(t_1, t_2) - r'| :\ \text{an inequality of the form } |d(t_1, t_2) - r'| \leq \varepsilon'/2$$
$$\text{appears in } i(\bar{x})\} \cup \{|R(\bar{t}) - r'| :\ \text{an inequality of the form}$$
$$|R(\bar{t}) - r'| \leq \varepsilon'/2 \text{ appears in } i(\bar{x})\}) \geq \varepsilon/2$$

is not realized by $\bar{a}$ in M. Since $M \models Th^c_{sup}(\mathcal{C})$, there are $M_i \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\bar{a}_i \in M_i$ so that $i(\bar{x})$ is realized in M_i by $\bar{a}_i$.

Let $J_i = \{j \in I : i \subseteq j\}$ and let $\mathcal{U}$ be an ultrafilter over I containing all J_i. The structure M can be embedded into

$$\prod_I M_i/\mathcal{U}$$

as follows. If c appears in i, then we map c to the corresponding element of the tuple $\bar{a}_i$. It is easy to see that the atomic diagram of M is satisfied by the induced mapping into $\prod_I M_i/\mathcal{U}$. $\square$

Metric groups Let us consider continuous metric structures which are groups. Below we always assume that all groups which are continuous structures are considered with respect to bi-invariant metrics. We take this assumption because any group which is a continuous structure has such a metric. See [13] for a discussion concerning this observation.

Since the algebraic approach from [10], [14] and [15] has become dominating in the literature, we now consider metric groups in slightly different terms.

Let G be a group. A function $l : G \to [0, \infty)$ is called a *pseudo length function* if
(i) $l(1) = 0$;
(ii) $l(g) = l(g^{-1})$;
(iii) $l(gh) \leq l(g) + l(h)$.
A *length function* is a pseudo length function satisfying

(i') $l(g) = 0$ if and only if $g = 1$, where $g \in G$.

A pseudo length function is *invariant* if $l(h^{-1}gh) = l(g)$ for all $g, h \in G$. In this case it defines an invariant pseudometric d by $l(gh^{-1})$. It becomes a metric if l is a length function. In this case we say that G is a *normed group*. We consider normed groups with bounded norms as a notion which is equivalent to metric groups (an easy exercise). It is worth noting that any unbounded bi-invariant norm l can be replaced by the norm $h \to \frac{l(h)}{1+l(h)}$ which defines the same topology with l.

Metric ultraproducts of normed groups of bounded diameter, say r, are defined as follows. Let (G_i, l_i), $i \in I$, be a family of groups equipped with invariant length functions and let Φ be an ultrafilter on I. Then

$$N = \{(x_i)_{i \in I} \in \prod_I G_i : lim_{i \to \Phi} l(x_i) = 0\}$$

is a normal subgroup of $\prod_I G_i$. The *metric ultraproduct* $\prod_I (G_i, l_i)/\Phi$ is defined to be $(\prod_I G_i)/N$ where the length function is defined by

$$l(xN) = lim_{i \to \Phi} l_i(x_i).$$

This definition corresponds to Section 2.4 from [14] and to the definition of metric ultraproducts in continuous model theory which was given above.

Since axiomatizable closures of classes of discrete structures are central in our paper, we make two easy remarks concerning this situation.

Firstly note that the class of all groups with the $\{0, 1\}$-metric is axiomatizable both in the discrete and in the continuous logic [1] . If we consider

[1] in this case axiomatizability in continuous logic is equivalent to axiomatizability in first-order logic

the class of all abstract groups under all discrete metrics then it becomes non-axiomatizable. For example it is not closed under metric ultraproducts.

On the other hand it may also happen that when we extend an axiomatizable class of groups with the $\{0,1\}$-metric by (abstract) structures from this class with all possible (not only possible discrete) metrics we lose axiomatizability. A nice example of this situation is the class of non-abelian groups with $[0,1]$-metrics. For example there is a sequence of non-abelian groups $G_n \leq Sym(2^n+3)$ with $G_n \cong \mathbb{Z}(2)^n \times S_3$ so that their metric unltraproduct with respect to Hamming metrics is abelian (an easy exercise).

2 Axiomatizability in continuous logic and sofic groups

Metric ultraproducts of finite normed groups are deserved a particular attention in group theory. This is mainly motivated by investigations of *sofic groups*. We remind the reader that a group G is called *sofic* if G embeds into a metric ultraproduct of finite symmetric groups with the Hamming distance d_H, [14]. We remind the reader that

$$d_H(g,h) = 1 - \frac{|Fix(g^{-1}h)|}{n} \text{ for } g,h \in S_n.$$

A group G is called *hyperlinear* if G embeds into a metric ultraproduct of finite-dimensional unitary groups $U(n)$ with the normalized Hilbert-Schmidt metric d_{HS} (i.e. the standard l^2 distance between matrices), [14]. It is an open question whether these classes are the same and whether any countable group is sofic/hyperlinear.

In the case of groups it is convinient to use the following notion of approximation, see [15] and [10] (Definition 3).

Definition 2.1 Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a class of groups and $\mathcal{L}$ be a class of invariant length functions on groups from $\mathcal{K}$ (*we will always assume that they are bounded by some fixed number* r). We say that a group G is $(\mathcal{K},\mathcal{L})$-approximable if there is a function $\alpha : G \to [0,r]$ with

$$\alpha(g) = 0 \Leftrightarrow g = 1,$$

so that for any finite $F \subset G$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $(H,l) \in \mathcal{K}$, $l \in \mathcal{L}$, and a function $\gamma : F \to H$ so that

$$l(\gamma(1)) < \varepsilon \ , \ \forall g \in F(l(\gamma(g)) \geq \alpha(g)) \ , \text{ and}$$

$$l(\gamma(gh)(\gamma(g)\gamma(h))^{-1}) < \varepsilon \ , \text{ for any } g,h,gh \in F.$$

It is known that a ghroup G is $(\mathcal{K},\mathcal{L})$-approximable if and only if it embeds into a metric ultraproduct of groups from $\mathcal{K}$ with norms from $\mathcal{L}$ ([15] and [10]). Moreover in the case of sofic and hyperlinear groups the function α can be taken constant on $G\setminus\{1\}$ with the value equal to any real number strictly between 0 and 1 (between 0 and 2 in the hyperlinear case).

A group G is called *weakly sofic* if G embeds into a metric ultraproduct of finite groups with invariant length functions bounded by 1 [11]. It is not known if this class coincides with the former ones.

When we consider *metric groups* this definition of approximation should be modified as follows.

Definition 2.2 Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a class of groups and $\mathcal{L}$ be a class of invariant length functions on groups from $\mathcal{K}$. We say that a metric group (G,d) is $(\mathcal{K},\mathcal{L})$-approximable if for any finite $F\subset G$ and $\delta>0$ there is $(H,l)\in\mathcal{K}$, $l\in\mathcal{L}$, and a function $\gamma: F\to H$ so that

$$(\forall g,h,gh\in F)(l(\gamma(gh)(\gamma(g)\gamma(h))^{-1})<\delta)\ ,\ \text{if } 1\in F\ ,\ \text{then } l(\gamma(1))<\delta\ ,$$

$$\text{and } (\forall g,h\in F)(|d(g,h)-l(\gamma(g)\gamma(h)^{-1})|<\delta.$$

It is easy to see that a metric group (G,d) with $d\le 1$ is $(\mathcal{K},\mathcal{L})$-approximable if and only if it isometrically embeds into a metric ultraproduct of $\mathcal{L}$-normed groups from $\mathcal{K}$.

Let us recall that $\mathcal{G}_{sof}$ denotes the class of metric groups of diameter 1 with bi-invariant metrics so that the groups are embeddable as closed subgroups via isometric morphisms into a metric ultraproduct of finite symmetric groups with Hamming metrics. In particular $\mathcal{G}_{sof}$ consists of continuous metric structures. We call it the class of *sofic metric groups*.

By $\mathcal{G}_{w.sof}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{hyplin}$ we denote the classes of continuous structures which are weakly sofic metric groups and hyperlinear metric groups (which are considered under the metric induced by $\frac{1}{2}d_{HS}$ in the corresponding ultraproducts of $U(n)$'s). In [1] Arzhantseva and Păunescu introduced *linear sofic groups* as ones which are approximated by all $GL_n(\mathbb{C})$ considered together with the metric $\rho(a,b)=n^{-1}\ \mathrm{rk}(a-b)$. Applying Definition 2.2 we introduce the class $\mathcal{G}_{l.sof}\subset\mathcal{G}$ of linear sofic metric groups.

Proposition 2.3 *The class of sofic (resp. linear sofic, hyperlinear and weakly sofic) metric groups is sup-axiomatizable, i.e. by its theory Th^c_{sup}.*

Proof. The class of metric ultraproducts of (S_n,d_H), $n\in\mathbb{N}$, is closed under iteration of metric ultraproducts. Thus the case of $\mathcal{G}_{sof}$ follows from Theorem 1.1. The remained cases are similar. □

Let us consider relationship among the classes of the following collection

$$\{\mathcal{G},\mathcal{G}_{sof},\mathcal{G}_{w.sof},\mathcal{G}_{hyplin},\mathcal{G}_{l.sof}\}$$

It is clear that $\mathcal{G}_{sof} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{w.sof} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$. Moreover, by the proof of Theorem 8.2 of [1] $\mathcal{G}_{l.sof} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{w.sof}$. Although the arguments from [14] and [1] that sofic groups are hyperlinear and linear sofic, do not allow the corresponding approximations of Hamming metrics, it still looks likely that $\mathcal{G}_{sof}$ is contained in the other classes. We will see below that there is an example from $\mathcal{G}_{w.sof} \setminus (\mathcal{G}_{sof} \cup \mathcal{G}_{hyplin} \cup \mathcal{G}_{l.sof})$. Thus $\mathcal{G}_{w.sof} \not\subset \mathcal{G}_{sof}$. In order to approach the other inclusions we investigate how discrete structures of these classes represent them.

It is folklore that any abstract sofic group can be embedded into a metric ultraproduct of finite symmetric groups as a discrete subgroup (see the proof of Theorem 3.5 of [14]). This means that the class of all abstract sofic groups consists of all groups which can be viewed as discrete structures of the class $\mathcal{G}_{sof}$ (with the $\{0,1\}$-metric). On the other hand any weakly sofic group (or weakly sofic metric group) embeds into a metric ultaproduct of discrete (even finite) metric groups. The following theorem is related to these observations in the cases of all groups and hyperlinear metric groups.

Theorem 2.4 *Let (G,d) be a bi-invariant metric group so that $d \leq 1$ and (G,d) is a continuous structure. Then the following statements hold.*

1. (G,d) is a closed subgroup of a metric ultraproduct of discrete bi-invriant metric groups. Moreover if G is weakly sofic in the standard sense of [11], then the groups occurring in the corresponding ultaproduct are weakly sofic too.

2. If (G,d) is hyperlinear then (G,d) is a closed subgroup of a metric ultraproduct of discrete bi-invriant metric groups which are hyperlinear.

The theorem will be proved in the next section. It shows that if two classes $\mathcal{K}_1$, $\mathcal{K}_2$ from the collection

$$\{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{G}_{sof}, \mathcal{G}_{w.sof}, \mathcal{G}_{hyplin}, \mathcal{G}_{l.sof}\}$$

have the same countable discrete structures, then $\mathcal{K}_1 = \mathcal{K}_2$. Indeed if $\mathcal{K}_1$ and $\mathcal{K}_2$ have the same discrete structures then they are generated as axiomatizable classes by the same set of structures (in the linear sofic case note that $(GL_n(\mathbb{C}), \rho)$ is a discrete structure). Thus they are the same. On the other hand any discrete metric structure of a finite language is naturally embedded into a metric ultraproduct of its countable substructures. This explains why we can additionally restrict ourselves by countable structures.

Theorem 2.6 below shows that $\mathcal{G}_{w.sof}$ differs from the classes $\{\mathcal{G}_{sof}, \mathcal{G}_{hyplin}, \mathcal{G}_{l.sof}\}$. Is every metric group a weakly sofic metric group? As above we may only consider countable discrete metric groups. The following remark shows that it suffices to consider the case of finitely generated free groups.

Remark 2.5 Concerning this question and Theorem 2.4 M.Doucha has pointed out to the author that in fact any metric group embeds into a metric ultraproduct of finitely generated free groups with discrete bi-invariant metrics.

This follows from the construction of [7] of a universal separable group $\mathbb{G}$ equipped with a complete bi-invariant metric bounded by 1. According to [7] $\mathbb{G}$ is the completion of a Fraïssé limit of free metric groups as above. Thus the following question becomes principal in this direction.

> Is every finitely generated free group with a bi-invariant metric weakly sofic?

It is interesting that this is exactly a reformulation of Question 3.5 of [7]. Moreover it is also noted in [7] that this question is equivalent to extreme amenability of $\mathbb{G}$.

As we have already mentioned before there are examples which show that $\mathcal{G}_{sof}$ is a proper subset of $\mathcal{G}_{w.sof}$. Moreover these classes already have different finite members. It is the time for the presentation of the example.

Let p be a prime number ≥ 3. Let us consider the cyclic group $\mathbb{Z}(p)$ with respect to so called Lee norm and Lee distances:

$$l_{Lee}(a) = \frac{2min(a, p-a)}{p-1} \ , \ d_{Lee}(a,b) = l_{Lee}(a-b).$$

This is the normalized distance in the Cayley graph of $\mathbb{Z}(p)$. The latter was considered in [2]. Note that $l_{Lee}(1) = \frac{2}{p-1}$ is the minimal non-zero value and

$$l_{Lee}(\frac{p-1}{2}) = l_{Lee}(\frac{p+1}{2}) = 1.$$

Theorem 2.6 *Let $p \geq 13$. The metric group $(\mathbb{Z}(p), d_{Lee})$ does not belong to $\mathcal{G}_{sof} \cup \mathcal{G}_{hyplin} \cup \mathcal{G}_{l.sof}$.*

Proof. Let us show that the group $(\mathbb{Z}(p), d_{Lee})$ is not d_H-approximable in the class of all symmetric groups S_n with Hamming metrics d_H. Fix any generator g of $\mathbb{Z}(p)$. In the situation of Definition 2.2 let δ be sufficiently small, n is much bigger than p and let $F = \mathbb{Z}(p) \setminus \{0\}$. Note that for any function γ from F into S_n as in that definition, any $\gamma(g^m)$ with $m \leq p$ coincides with $\gamma(g)^m$ on a $(1 - p \cdot \delta)$-th part of $\{1, ..., n\}$ (apply the definition of d_H). Thus the function γ defines an action of $\mathbb{Z}(p)$ on some $(1-p\cdot\delta)$-th part of $\{1, ..., n\}$. Since $\mathbb{Z}(p)$ is cyclic and simple, any non-trivial f_1 and $f_2 \in F$ have the same orbits on this part of $\{1, ..., n\}$. In particular $Fix(\gamma(f_1)) = Fix(\gamma(f_2))$ there and the difference between Hamming norms of $\gamma(f_1)$ and $\gamma(f_2)$ does not exceed $p \cdot \delta$. Thus if $d_{Lee}(f_1, f_2) = \frac{1}{2}$ and $l_{Lee}(f_1) = \frac{2}{p-1}$, then the final inequality of Definition 2.2 cannot hold for f_1 and f_2 until each $Fix(\gamma(f_1))$ and $Fix(\gamma(f_2))$ is approximately a half of $\{1, ..., n\}$. In the latter case that inequality does not hold for 0 (the neutral element) and f_1.

To see that $(\mathbb{Z}(p), d_{Lee})$ does not belong to $\mathcal{G}_{l.sof}$ we apply the same argument replacing (S_n, d_H) by $(GL_n(\mathbb{C}), \rho)$. If g, δ and γ are as above, then we

get that $\gamma(g)$ almost coincides with a semisimple element of $GL_n(\mathbb{C})$, say a (because $\gamma(g)$ is $p\delta$-close with respect to ρ to an element of finite order). We know that a is presented by a diagonal matrix over $\mathbb{C}$. Since the diagonal elements of a are p-th roots of 1, we see that when $0 < i < p$ the matrices $a - id$ and $a^i - id$ have the same 0-entries. This provides a contradiction as above.

In the hyperlinear case we consider $(U(n), \frac{1}{2}d_{HS})$ instead of $(GL_n(\mathbb{C}), \rho)$. Then fixing an appropriate base of $\mathbb{C}^n$ we find a diagonal matrix a so that for all $0 < j < p$ the powers a^j are $p\delta$-close to $\gamma(g^j)$ with respect to $\frac{1}{2}d_{HS}$. Assume that $l_{Lee}(g) = \frac{2}{p-1}$ (otherwise we can choose another generator) and the $\frac{1}{2}d_{HS}$-distance between a and id is a number δ-close to $\frac{2}{p-1}$. Note that the diagonal elements of a are p-th roots of 1, say $e^{i\phi_1}, ..., e^{i\phi_n}$. In particular each a^j can be identified with the point $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(e^{i\cdot j\phi_1}, ..., e^{i\cdot j\phi_n})$ of the unit ball in $\mathbb{C}^n$. Moreover the d_{HS}-distance between any a^k and a^l is exactly the distance between the corresponding points of the ball. Note that all $d_{HS}(a^j, a^{j+1})$, $0 \leq j < p$, are the same. Since the module of the number $e^{i\phi_k} - 1$ equals to $\sqrt{2 - 2cos(\phi_k)}$, these distances can be computed as follows:

$$d_{HS}(a, id) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{n}}\sqrt{1 - cos(\phi_1) + ... + 1 - cos(\phi_n)}.$$

On the othe hand our assumptions imply

$$\frac{2}{p-1} \approx \frac{1}{2}d_{HS}(a, id).$$

Thus we see that 2 $(= \frac{4}{p-1} \cdot \frac{p-1}{2})$ can be approximately presented as

$$\sum_{j=1}^{(p-1)/2} d_{HS}(a^{j-1}, a^j),$$

which in turn is the sum of distances between the corresponding points of the unit ball. On the other hand the d_{HS}-distance from $a^{(p-1)/2}$ to id is

$$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{n}}\sqrt{1 - cos((p-1)\phi_1/2) + ... + 1 - cos((p-1)\phi_n/2)}.$$

Since $a^{(p-1)/2}$ does not represent $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(-1, ..., -1)$, this distance is much shorter than the sum above (we may assume that the difference cannot be compared with $p\delta$). Thus d_{Lee} cannot be approximated by $\frac{1}{2}d_{HS}$. $\square$

Remark 2.7 It is clear that the statement above holds if we replace $\mathbb{Z}(p)$ by any metric group where $(\mathbb{Z}(p), d_{Lee})$ can be embedded as a metric subgroup

(with possible normalization). For example let us consider $\mathbb{Z}(p^s)$, where p is prime and $s \geq 2$. Let g be a generator of $\mathbb{Z}(p^s)$. Let us consider the sequence of embeddings

$$p^{s-1}\mathbb{Z}(p^s) \to p^{s-2}\mathbb{Z}(p^s) \to ... \to p\mathbb{Z}(p^s) \to \mathbb{Z}(p^s).$$

If $g_1, g_2 \in \mathbb{Z}(p^s)$ belong to distinct $p^k\mathbb{Z}(p^s)$-classes, where k is minimal, let us define

$$d(g_1, g_2) = \frac{1}{2^{k-1}}.$$

If $g_1 - g_2 \in p^{s-1}\mathbb{Z}(p^s)$, then identifying the fixed generators of $p^{s-1}\mathbb{Z}(p^s)$ (i.e. $p^{s-1}g$) and of $\mathbb{Z}(p)$ we define the distance

$$d(g_1, g_2) = \frac{1}{2^{s-1}} l_{Lee}(g_1 - g_2).$$

It is easy to see that d is a metric, and behaves as an ultrametric for elements from distinct cosets.

3 Shifting metrics

In order to prove Theorem 2.4 let us consider the following construction.

Definition 3.1 Let (G, d) be a metric group with $d \leq 1$ and $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$. Let d_ε be the metric on G defined by the following rule:

$$d_\varepsilon(g, h) = \frac{d(g, h) + \varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon} \text{ , for } g \neq h.$$

We call d_ε the ε-shift of d. [2]

It is easy to see that if (G, d) is a bi-invariant metric group, then (G, d_ε) is a bi-invariant metric group too. Moreover (G, d_ε) is discrete. The hyperlinear case of Theorem 2.4(2) is based on the following theorem. We think that the sofic case below is interesting in itself.

Theorem 3.2 *If (G, d) is a sofic (resp. hyperlinear) metric group then (G, d_ε) is a sofic (resp. hyperlinear) metric group too.*

Proof. Let us consider the case of a sofic metric group (G, d). We will assume that ε is sufficiently small. Take any $\delta < \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}$. For every finite $F \subset G$ there is a number n and an embedding $\theta : F \to S_n$ so that
- if $g, h, gh \in F$, then $d_H(\theta(g)\theta(h), \theta(gh)) < \delta$,

[2] we are grateful to Krzysztof Majcher who suggested, that this construction is useful under our circumstances

- if $1 \in F$, then $d_H(\theta(1), id) < \delta$,
- for all distinct $g, h \in F$, $|d(h, g) - d_H(\theta(h), \theta(g))| < \delta$.

On the other hand since G is sofic by the proof of Theorem 3.5 of [14] there are m and an embedding $\theta' : F \to S_m$ so that
- if $g, h, gh \in F$, then $d_H(\theta'(g)\theta'(h), \theta'(gh)) < \delta$,
- if $1 \in F$, then $d_H(\theta'(1), id) < \delta$,
- for all distinct $g, h \in F$, $|d_H(\theta'(h), \theta'(g)) - 1| < \delta$.

Note that m can be taken arbitrary large: having θ' we can copy it as many times as we need. If $m' > m$ then extending elements of F to the set $\{m+1, m+2, ..., m'\}$ by identity, we can reduce the numbers δ and $1-\delta$ in these conditions to a smaller ones. In particular taking m' large enough considering representations in $S_{m'}$, we may modify the last contition as follows:
- for all distinct $g, h \in F$, $|d_H(\theta'(h), \theta'(g)) - \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}| < \frac{\delta \cdot \varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}$.

Note that this construction guarantees that $\frac{m}{m'}$ is close to $\frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}$. Since m and m' can be taken arbitrary large we may assume (neglecting small subsets) that $n|(m'-m)$ and moreover there is an equivalence relation E on the set $\{1, ..., m'\}$ consisting of classes of the same size so that $\{1, ..., m\}$ and $\{m+1, ..., m'\}$ are E-invariant and $|\{m+1, ..., m'\}/E| = n$. Identifying $\{1, ..., n\}$ with $\{m+1, ..., m'\}/E$ we will assume that the action of elements of F on $\{m+1, ..., m'\}$ is defined by $\frac{m'-m}{n}$ copies of the action θ of elements of F on $\{1, ..., n\}$ so that each copy is a transversal with respect to E.

This naturally amalgamates θ and $\theta' \restriction \{1, ..., m\}$ to permutations on $\{1, ..., m'\}$. It is easy to see that the resulting map $\theta'' : F \to S_{m'}$ satisfies the following conditions:
- if $g, h, gh \in F$, then $d_H(\theta''(g)\theta''(h), \theta''(gh)) < \delta$,
- if $1 \in F$, then $d_H(\theta''(e), id) < \delta$,
- for all distinct $g, h \in F$, $|d_\varepsilon(h, g) - d_H(\theta''(h), \theta''(g))| < \delta$.

To see the latter note that under the natural action of $h^{-1}g$ on $\{m+1, ..., m'\}$ the size of the support is approximately $d(g, h) \cdot (m'-m)$. Since $\frac{m'-m}{m'}$ is approximately $\frac{1}{1+\varepsilon}$ we see that $d_H(\theta''(h), \theta''(g))$ is approximately

$$\frac{d(g,h)}{1+\varepsilon} + \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon} = \frac{d(g,h)+\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}.$$

We now discuss how this argument can be adapted to hyperlinear groups. Let us start with a metric hyperlinear group (G, d) with $d \leq 1$. Choosing ε, δ and a finite set F as above we find a number n and an embedding $\theta : F \to U(n)$ so that
- if $g, h, gh \in F$, then $d_{HS}(\theta(g)\theta(h), \theta(gh)) < \delta$,
- if $1 \in F$, then $d_{HS}(\theta(1), id) < \delta$,
- for all distinct $g, h \in F$, $|d(h, g) - \frac{1}{2} d_{HS}(\theta(h), \theta(g))| < \delta$.

By Theorem 3.6 and Remark 3.7 of [14] there are m and an embedding $\theta' : F \to U(m)$ so that

- if $g, h, gh \in F$, then $d_{HS}(\theta'(g)\theta'(h), \theta'(gh)) < \delta$,
- if $1 \in F$, then $d_{HS}(\theta'(1), id) < \delta$,
- for all distinct $g, h \in F$, $\frac{1}{2}d_{HS}(\theta'(h), \theta'(g)) > 1 - \delta$.

To extend the remaining argument from the sofic to the hyperlinear case we need the following general observation. Given $\mu : F \to U(k)$, which embeds F into $U(k)$ as above, one can naturally copy the actions of elements of F in the space $\mathbb{C}^{k'k}$ so that the distance between the corresponding images of g and h in $U(k'k)$ coincides with $\frac{1}{2}d_{HS}(\mu(h), \mu(g))$. On the other hand if instead of this we extend μ to the remaining direct summands in $\mathbb{C}^{k'k}$ by identity we can reduce the distances as much as we need. Thus the argument above can be carried over in the hyperlinear case. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 2.4. Let $\{\varepsilon_n\} \to 0$. Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a non-principal ultrafilter on ω. Then (G, d) embeds into $\prod_{i\in\omega}(G, d_{\varepsilon_i})/\mathcal{U}$ under the diagonal map. Since (G, d) is complete, it is a closed subgroup of the ultraproduct. The rest follows from Theorem 3.2. $\square$

In the linear sofic case Theorem 3.2 should be modified. The problem is that in this case the corresponding version of amplification does not work in the same way as in the case of sofic and hyperlinear groups. Namely it is not known if the value of the function α from Definition 2.1 can be taken equal to any real number strictly between 0 and 1. It is only proved in Proposition 5.13 of [1] that it can be made $\geq 1/4$:

> a group G is linearly sofic if and only if it can be embedded into a metric ultraproduct of metric groups $(GL_n(\mathbb{C}), \rho)$ so that any non-identity element of G is distant from the identity by $\geq \frac{1}{4}$.

We denote the metric in this ultraproduct by d_ω and consider G under the corresponding restriction of d_ω. Let us define the following metric on G:

$$d^\omega_\varepsilon(g, h) = \frac{d(g, h) + \varepsilon d_\omega(g, h)}{1 + \varepsilon} \text{ , when } g \neq h.$$

It is clear that for $g \neq h$,

$$d^\omega_\varepsilon(g, h) \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{4 + 4\varepsilon};$$

thus $(G, d^\omega_\varepsilon)$ is a discrete group.

Theorem 3.3 *If (G, d) is a linearly sofic metric group then $(G, d^\omega_\varepsilon)$ is a linearly sofic metric group too.*

Proof. We adapt the proof of Theorem 3.2 as follows. Take any $\delta < \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}$. For every finite $F \subset G$ there is a number n and an embedding $\theta : F \to GL_n(\mathbb{C})$ so that

- if $g, h, gh \in F$, then $\rho(\theta(g)\theta(h), \theta(gh)) < \delta$,
- if $1 \in F$, then $\rho(\theta(1), id) < \delta$,
- for all distinct $g, h \in F$, $|d(h, g) - \rho(\theta(h), \theta(g))| < \delta$.

On the other hand there are m and an embedding $\theta' : F \to GL_m(\mathbb{C})$ so that
- if $g, h, gh \in F$, then $\rho(\theta'(g)\theta'(h), \theta'(gh)) < \delta$,
- if $1 \in F$, then $\rho(\theta'(1), id) < \delta$,
- for all distinct $g, h \in F$, $|\rho(\theta'(h), \theta'(g)) - d_\omega(h, g)| < \delta$.

The number m can be taken arbitrary large: for some k one can naturally copy the actions of elements of F in the space $\mathbb{C}^{mk}$ so that the distance between the corresponding images of g and h in $GL_{km}(\mathbb{C})$ coincides with $\rho(\theta'(h), \theta'(g))$.

If $m' > m$ then extending θ to the remaining direct summands in $\mathbb{C}^{m'}$ by identity we can reduce the numbers δ and $d_\omega(h, g) - \delta$ in these conditions. We make the reduction so that:
- for all distinct $g, h \in F$, $|\rho(\theta'(h), \theta'(g)) - \frac{\varepsilon d_\omega(h,g)}{1+\varepsilon}| < \frac{\delta \cdot \varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}$.

As in the proof of Theorem 3.2, $\frac{m}{m'}$ is close to $\frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}$. Applying the remaining argument of Theorem 3.2 we obtain a map $\theta'' : F \to GL_{m'}(\mathbb{C})$ so that for all distinct $g, h \in F$, $\rho(\theta''(h), \theta''(g))$ is approximately

$$\frac{d(g, h)}{1 + \varepsilon} + \frac{\varepsilon d_\omega(g, h)}{1 + \varepsilon}.$$

□

Note that Theorems 2.4 and 3.2 obviously hold in the case of any variety of groups. For example we can everywhere replace hyperlinearity by nilpotence of degree n or solubility of degree n.

On the other hand it is worth noting that many classes of metric groups studied in geometric group theory do not satisfy the property of Theorem 3.2. Indeed for example any compact group can be considered with respect to a bi-invariant metric $d \leq 1$. Such a group is always amenable and has Kazhdan's property (**T**), [3]. Since there are compact groups containing non-abelian free subgroups, moving from d to d_ε we can lose amenability. We can also consider uncountable compact groups (G, d) (or just compact groups without finite Kazhdan's sets). In this case (G, d_ε) does not have (**T**). Adding an appropriate direct summand these examples can be made non-compact locally compact.

Note that it is easy to see that if (G, d_ε) is amenable (has (**T**), **FH** or **OB**, see [3], [6]), then so is (G, d). On the other hand it is worth noting that all these properties and their negations are not axiomatizable in continuous logic (see [12]).

Remark 3.4 We do not know if any version of Theorem 3.2 holds in the case of weakly sofic metric groups. For example, we do not know if the condition

that (G, d) is weakly sofic implies that (G, d_ε) is weakly sofic too. At first sight the following idea may work. Let (G, d) embed into a metric ultraproduct of finite metric groups (G_i, d_i). Then one can try to approximate (G, d_ε) by all $(G_i, (d_i)_\varepsilon)$. The problem is that elements of $\prod G_i$ of norm 0 under metrics $d_i : i \in \mathbb{N}$, have norm ε under metrics $(d_i)_\varepsilon : i \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus we do not even know if the metric ultraproduct of all $(G_i, (d_i)_\varepsilon)$ has a subgroup isomorphic to G.

References

[1] Arzhantseva, G., Päunescu, L.: Linear sofic groups and algebras. To appear in Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. (arXiv:1212.6780, 2012)

[2] Batagelj, V.: Norms and Distances over finite groups. J.Combin. Inform. System Sci. **20**, no. 1 - 4, 243 - 252 (1995)

[3] Bekka, B., de la Harpe, P., Valette, P.: Kazhdan's Property (T). New Mathematical Monographs, 11, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2008)

[4] Ben Yaacov, I., Berenstein, A., Henson, W., Usvyatsov, A.: Model theory for metric structures. In: Model theory with Applications to Algebra and Analysis, v.2 (Chatzidakis, Z., Macpherson, H.D., Pillay A., Wilkie, A., eds.), London Math. Soc. Lecture Notes, v.350, pp. 315 - 427, Cambridge University Press (2008)

[5] Capraro, V., Lupini, M.: Introduction to Sofic and hyperlinear groups and Connes' embedding conjecture. With an appendix by Vladimir Pestov. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 2136. Springer, Cham, viii+151 pp. (2015)

[6] de Cornulier, Y.: A sofic group away from amenable groups. Math. Ann., **350**, 269 - 275 (2011)

[7] Doucha, M.: Metrical universality for groups. To appear in Forum Math. (arXiv:1410.1380, 2014)

[8] Elek G., E.Szabo, E.: Hyperlinearity, essentially free actions and L^2-invariants. The sofic property. Math. Ann., **332**, 421 - 441 (2005)

[9] Farah, I., Hart, B., Sherman, D.: Model theory of operator algebras II: Model theory. Israel J. Math. **201**, no. 1, 477 - 505 (2014)

[10] Glebsky, L.: Approximation of groups, characterisations of sofic groups, and equations over groups. Arxiv: 1506.06940 (2015)

[11] Glebsky, L., Rivera, L.M.: Sofic groups and profinite topology on free groups. J. Algebra **320**, no. 9, 3512 - 3518 (2008)

[12] Ivanov, A.: Locally compact groups and continuous logic. Arxiv: 1206.5473 (2012)

[13] Ivanov, A.: Locally compact groups which are separably categorical structures. arXiv:1506.00905 (2015)

[14] Pestov, V.: Hyperlinear and sofic groups: a brief guide. Bull. Symb. Logic, **14**, 449 - 480 (2008)

[15] Thom, A.: About the metric approximation of Higman's group. J. Group Theory **15**, no. 2, 301 - 310 (2012)

1. Institute of Mathematics, University of Wroclaw, pl.Grunwaldzki 2/4, 50-384 Wroclaw, Poland
2. Institute of Mathematics, Silesian University of Technology,
ul. Kaszubska 23, 48-101 Gliwice,
Poland
Aleksander.Iwanow@polsl.pl